

Appl. No. 10/622,411  
Amdt. dated  
Reply to Office action of August 18, 2004

Amendments of Claims:

NIL

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action of August 18, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 9 and 17 – 20 under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5,821,760 (Koeman hereinafter). Furthermore, claims 7, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being obvious over Koeman in view of US Patent 6,636,048 (Sciacero hereinafter), and US Patent 5,483,684 (Ono hereinafter) respectively. Further, claim 8 was rejected as being obvious over Koeman in view of US Patent 5,532,603 (Bottmann). The applicant respectfully submits that this is not the case.

Original claims 1, 8 and 9 of the present application are directed to a method and a system which process a raw cross-talk signal (comprising far-end and near-end components) in the frequency domain to determine a combination of near-end cross talk components.

US 5,821,760 (Koeman et al.)

Koeman discloses a method and an apparatus for measuring near end cross-talk in patch cords wherein a time domain, pulse-based method is utilized that separates, i.e. processes, the near-end and the far-end pulse response times in the time domain signal (cf. column 5, lines 10-13 or column 7, lines 29-35 of Koeman). Only after this processing, a frequency domain representation of the separated near-end and far-end response time records is generated by applying a discrete Fourier transform on the separated near-end and far-end response time records (cf. column 5, lines 16-20). Accordingly, in Koeman all processing of the raw cross talk signal is carried out in the time domain.

As such, the applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter of independent claims 1, 8 and 9 and thus the entire claimed subject matter is novel over Koeman.

Applicant also respectfully submits that original claims 1-20 are not only novel but also not obvious. The method of Koeman does not teach or suggest to conduct the processing of a raw cross-talk signal components in the frequency domain. Instead, Koeman explains that processing in the time domain allows for the near-end cross-talk (NEXT) to be measured more accurately (column 10, lines 43-45) and that separating near-end and far-end cross talk components in the frequency domain is problematic and cannot readily be achieved (column 7, lines 23-29). Thus, Koeman teaches away from processing raw cross-talk signal in the frequency domain to determine a combination of near-end cross talk components. Accordingly, the subject matter of claims 1-20 is not obvious in view of Koeman alone or any combination of Koeman with Sciacero, Ono or Bottmann.

Conclusion

In the light of the above-mentioned remarks, the applicant kindly requests for a timely issuance of the Notice of Allowance in this application.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Marc Bobys  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 45,267  
Direct dial: (+65) 6215-8672 (Singapore)

Agilent Technologies, Inc.  
Legal Department, M/S DL429  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 7599  
Loveland, CO 80537-0599